



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in the world that is enduring save change itself; but the moral will is itself a fixed point within the stream of change, and this is the one rock that man must cling to or he himself will be swept off into the unending whirl of existence; and finally there is in the sense of well-doing a joy that is all-satisfying and

sufficient to justify the strenuous persistence in duty. When we learn to live simply for the sake of being good, the whole world is transformed into abundant opportunities of happiness. For the man who has come to this conclusion, there is only one note of life to be struck—"Live joyfully."

THE PRINCIPLES OF PACIFISM

JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM, D.D.

Professor of Christian Theology in Pacific Theological Seminary,
Berkeley, California

The gross misunderstandings of the pacifist's position are part of the price he has to pay. He can stand them, better than the cause. To give *that* its dues, to understand what it is and what it intends, is most vital at this juncture—at least so the pacifist believes.

The term itself, to begin with, is misleading. How much better "fraternality" and "fraternalist" would have been! But it is useless to cry over misnomers. "Pacifism" it has been called and pacifism it will probably remain.

Perhaps there is no better way of understanding pacifism than by first recognizing what it is not. The writer gives his own interpretation of it.

1. Pacifism is not a novelty and it is not confined to America. The effort to establish international peace is older than the oldest peace society, and that was founded in 1828. Before the outbreak of the war there were several hundred peace societies. Never had

the cause been so aggressive and so hopeful as at that crucial moment. It was not then, and is not now, an American but a world-wide enterprise. Its present advocates are by no means confined to Americans. When so eminent a philosopher and man as Bertrand Russell, grandson of Lord John Russell, takes the field against war, it cannot be said to be silent in England. Mr. Russell is the author of the volume *Justice in War Time*. In an article in a recent number of the *Open Court* he has the courage to write: "Both on their side and on ours, the real motive which prolongs the war is pride. Is there no statesman who can think in terms of Europe, not only of separate nations?" In France, M. Romain Rolland, author of *Above the Battle*, has been denounced as a traitor for his advocacy of internationalism. In Sweden, the Ford Peace Party (if it did no more) discovered a convinced group of pacifists. These are but random instances of what, there is

good reason to believe, is going on in all parts of the world. The seeds of a peace movement beside which past propagandisms are insignificant seem now to be germinating. The harvest may come more rapidly than kings and emperors, presidents and mayors, imagine.

2. Pacifism does not mean passivity. The term "non-resistance" is seldom found in its vocabulary. It is essentially active, positive, outreaching. It seeks to *make* peace rather than to *preserve* peace. Pacifism does not renounce physical force. It accepts it where such force is used in the interest of moral government for purposes of restraint and the enforcement of law. But this is a mere auxiliary and subordinate implement. Its main confidence is in a vastly superior form of force—loyalty to moral obligation. In dealing with nations, as with individuals, this is the only sufficient reliance. Pacifism calls for the full recognition and employment of the constructive, unifying power of moral law.

3. Pacifism is not in any way identical with the "comfortable isolation" kind of peace. The get-away-from-there-and-let-them-fight-it-out-among-themselves brand of peace is almost, if not quite, as bad as war. That might have been justifiable for our nation in its infancy; it is not now. The pacifists do not advocate any such peace policy as that. Their motive is not safety but service. They would have ours not a hermit nation but a humanitarian nation.

4. Pacifism does not deny that there are noble virtues and achievements that attach to war, nor does it condemn those

who have "nobly fought and died" in the past. It recognizes the law of moral development by which humanity comes progressively to recognize social evils and one by one to slough them off in spite of the incidental benefits that cling to them. Slavery had its mitigations and amenities, but they did not justify it; and it went down before advancing moral conviction. Absolute monarchy was not without its alleviations, but it was out of keeping with moral progress. War has its attendant heroisms and nobilities, but its nature is hostile to human welfare. In the days when we were playing with this peace issue, William James wrote of *Moral Substitutes for War*. We are now coming to see that war itself has been a substitute for a more vital moral conflict. Militarism is one thing; militancy is another.

Approached from the positive side pacifism discovers itself:

1. As a *principle*, or a set of principles, not a mere sentiment. It rests upon a rational conception of human society and its permanent forces. If it adopts the Golden Rule it recognizes also a law behind the rule. It holds that there is nothing so fundamental, and in the end so commanding, as good-will—a force that has shown itself able to dissolve enmities and misunderstandings which armies and navies only arouse and inflame. It sees in the Rooseveltian big stick only the symbol of timidity and suspicion—fear to trust in the underlying decency and good faith of mankind. Not that pacifism rose-tints humanity. It is aware of the risks which an attitude of friendliness involves, but it is willing to accept these risks and suffer for them if necessary.

2. Pacifism is not only a principle but a policy. It calls for a deliberate and carefully planned program by means of which international friendliness shall be promoted and international duties given equal place with international "rights." It calls for the carrying out of the policy so ably inaugurated by John Hay. It believes in making The Hague not merely a prophecy but a potency. It calls for an international court and an international police. It looks toward a common solution of the common problem of relating population and territory, needs and resources. It desires an internationalism in which occidental and oriental nations shall meet in a common brotherhood. In a word, its creed is: "Humanity before all nations."

3. Pacifism believes that war has become criminal and that to continue its reign is obscurantism and folly. Whatever glamor invested war in past generations has now vanished. The present conflict with its vandalism, its slaughter, its submarines, its zeppelins, its reprisals, its damnations, has withdrawn the last vestige of illusion from war. The thing in all its hideousness and loathsomeness stands naked—and unashamed. But the participants are becoming ashamed, or will as soon as the fury of this obsession cools. If its practices were not so damnable, its *childishness* would be its most marked trait. That quality is not hidden even from some of those engaged in it, as is indicated by recent words of an English company officer quoted in *The Venturer*:

"What I have felt chiefly about the war is its vileness and its out-of-dateness. . . . More and more I have felt it to be a child's game played by those who had pretended to be grown up."

4. Pacifism holds that the way to peace is along the road of peace, not that of war.

If the futility of "preparedness" to prevent war has not been demonstrated by the present war; it asks, what constitutes demonstration? Whether after this holocaust is over the exhausted and debt-burdened nations of Europe will re-arm and prepare to carry on the old fatal military system or not, the pacifist does not know. He regards it as extremely unlikely. But he is sure that for America to do anything to increase the supposed necessity of perpetuating this system would be treason to her principles and ideals. If by our building of battleships and raising of armies we are about to lay a heavier burden upon the shoulders of the overtaxed workingman of Europe, or of the Orient, we shall incur a deep and deserved reproach.

To be concerned only for our "rights" and our "defenses" when a bleeding and insane world is in need of a steady brain and a friendly arm is neither Christian, nor human—nor American.

Upon such principles as these pacifism rests—confident that they make for the true welfare both of humanity and of the nation. If they are not sound principles, pacifism is in error; if they are, it is the highest courage and wisdom to enforce them.